



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/657,234	09/07/2000	James Patrick Allen	ROC9-2000-0220-US1	1600
7590	03/25/2005		EXAMINER	
Joan Pennington 535 North Michigan Avenue Unit 1804 Chicago, IL 60611			ENGLAND, DAVID E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>DL</i></p> <p>Supplemental Advisory Action</p> <p>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/657,234	ALLEN ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
David E. England	2143	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-6 and 8-18.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

13. Other: _____.


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Kelman does not teach a storage area network (SAN) management and configuration method via enabling in-band communications comprising the step of providing a pass through in said HBA device driver for passing communications to a device in the storage area network from said SAN management application, including at least one topology analysis command. Nor does Kelman include suggestion or motivation for providing a pass through in said HBA device driver, as taught and claimed by Applicants.

As to part 1, in response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "a storage area network (SAN) management and configuration method via enabling in-band communications comprising the step of " has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Examiner would like to draw the Applicant's attention to the claimed limitations that are broad in interpretation. First, the limitation of "a device" is not specifically taught as to what the device could be specifically, therefore, it can be broadly interpreted as any type of device that can be in a SAN. Furthermore, the Applicant does not state what the "SAN management application" consists of. Also, the limitation of "including at least one topology analysis command" is not specified as to which or what types of topology analysis commands could be. The Applicant's specification says on page 5, "For example, the commands include topology analysis commands, such as what is connected to what, and in what zone, and the like." The Applicant does not specifically define the limitation of "topology analysis commands" because an example is not a definition of a limitation, rather it is a guide line, furthermore, the phase "and the like" leaves the limitation open ended for a wide range of interpretations by the Examiner. The Applicant can overcome this broadness by stating in the claim language specific limitations like, "the topology analysis consisting of at least what is connected to what, and in what zone". Note this is just a suggestion and would need to be worded differently but following these types of guide lines. Therefore, Kelman teaches a pass through in said HBA device driver for passing communications to a device in the storage area network from said SAN management application, including at least one topology analysis command. If the Applicant were to draw their attention to Kelman, columns 5 - 7, the Applicant will see that the Storage controller can be used to set up communications and to schedule backup with the system administrator through the use of programs to the devices. A communication from the SAN to the server is established and information and protocols are communicated to the devices to restore lost information, which can be interpreted as "a device", "a San management application" and "at least one topology analysis command".

When reviewing a reference the applicants should remember that not only the specific teachings of a reference but also reasonable inferences which the artisan would have logically drawn therefrom may be properly evaluated in formulating a rejection. *In re Preda*, 401 F. 2d 825, 159 USPQ 342 (CCPA 1968) and *In re Shepard*, 319 F. 2d 194, 138 USPQ 148 (CCPA 1963). Skill in the art is presumed. *In re Sovish*, 769 F. 2d 738, 226 USPQ 771 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Furthermore, artisans must be presumed to know something about the art apart from what the references disclose. *In re Jacoby*, 309 F. 2d 513, 135 USPQ 317 (CCPA 1962). The conclusion of obviousness may be made from common knowledge and common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference. *In re Bozek*, 416 F.2d 1385, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969). Every reference relies to some extent on knowledge of persons skilled in the art to complement that which is disclosed therein. *In re Bode*, 550 F. 2d 656, 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA 1977). Rejection still stands.

The Applicant further states that there is no motivation yet the rejection is under 102, therefore there is no need for a motivation to combine a reference.

In the Remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Kelman and Haren do not disclose the teaching in claim 11.

As to part 2, the response that is found in part 1 has similar weight in this response and therefore is incorporated for it's similarities. Rejections still stand. .